



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/699,124

10/31/2003

William M. Shapiro

07844-621001

4993

21876 7590 12/09/2009
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.
P.O. Box 1022
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER

CERVETTI, DAVID GARCIA

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2436

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/09/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/699,124	Applicant(s) SHAPIRO ET AL.	
	Examiner David García Cervetti	Art Unit 2436	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19,21-41 and 43-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19,21-41 and 43-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's arguments filed 8/14/2009 have been fully considered.
2. Claims 1-19, 21-41, and 43-57 are pending and have been examined. Claims 20 and 42 have been canceled.

Response to Amendment

3. The requested IDSs (10/31/03 and 9/21/07) have been previously signed and submitted with the office action dated 12/10/2007.
4. The rejection under 35 USC 101 is withdrawn.
5. Regarding the argument that the actions are unrelated to a document, Examiner respectfully points out that Garcia teaches providing offline access to a particular document, and then the user can create a document while offline, i.e. second document. Further, the access control to this second document is "unrelated to the electronic document " for which offline access is provided.
6. When the user gets back to the company's premises and synchronizes (transparently), the synchronization applies not only to the files for which off-line access was requested prior to leave the premises, but also to the ones created while off-line (col.3-4).
7. Regarding the statement "Rather, the claimed subject matter covers synchronizing offline access information before going offline, so previously created documents can still be accessed while offline. The Office has failed to address this subject matter, or how Garcia can be considered to teach this subject matter as a whole", Examiner points out that Garcia teaches such feature, since before going

offline, (Garcia, col.32-33) the user requests offline access authorization which is processed by the server, and includes updating (i.e. synchronize) rules and keys for offline access. The arguments are not persuasive.

8. The issue with the address of the server (claim 19) is a matter of inherency, since somehow the client and the server communicate securely, an address is needed, and computer systems inherently possess an identifier or address when connected to a network. Furthermore, Garcia teaches an encrypted portion of a header including the access control rules, which Examiner interprets as inherently including the control server address in order to synchronize when connected. Even assuming arguendo none of this is "reasonable", Houston (20040030702) literally teaches such feature, a document includes the address of the server.

9. While the breadth of the claims in the application should always be carefully noted; that is, the examiner should be fully aware of what the claims do not call for, as well as what they do require; during patent examination, the claims are given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.

10. Regarding the arguments against the prior art, Examiner respectfully submits that Garcia does in fact teach the amended portion, an action unrelated to a second electronic document (col.4, lines 25-50, create documents off-line and synchronizing when back online). Arguments are not persuasive. Furthermore, adding an address (claim 19) to the myriad of items already taught by Garcia would have been obvious, and Examiner submits that the address is inherent to the system, in order for the client

to know to which server it needs to communicate, transparently. Arguments are not persuasive.

11. Regarding the traversal of the Official Notice taken by Examiner, Examiner submits that Beard et al. (2005/0044378, par.109-112, 7,302,570, col.15, lines 15-35), Johnston et al. (7,058,663, claim 1), Altenhofen et al. (2003/0232318, par.78-87), Seo et al. (2002/0046176, par.19, 38, 47, claim 8) teach the features.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

13. Claims 1, 4-19, 21-23, 26-41, and 43-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Garcia (US Patent 7,380,120).

Regarding claims 1 and 23, Garcia teaches

receiving a request from a client to take an action with respect to a first electronic document (col.32, lines 20-67, offline access enablement for particular files), the action unrelated to a second electronic document (col.4, lines 25-50, create documents off-line); and

synchronizing offline access information with the client, in response to the request, to pre-authorize the client, to allow actions by a user as a member of a group of users, by sending to the client an update to offline access information retained at the client, the update comprising a first key associated with the group, the first key being useable at the client to access a second electronic document while offline by decrypting

a second key in the second electronic document (col.33, lines 1-55, update stored rules).

Regarding claims 12 and 34, Garcia teaches

receiving a request to take an action with respect to a first electronic document (col.32, lines 20-67, offline access enablement for particular files), , the action unrelated to a second electronic document (col.4, lines 25-50, create documents off-line); and

synchronizing offline access information with a document control server in response to the request, when online, to pre-authorize offline access to the second electronic document, the synchronizing comprising receiving an update to offline access information retained locally, the update comprising a first key associated with a group of users of the document control server (col.33, lines 1-55, update stored rules); and

allowing access to the second electronic document, when offline, by performing operations comprising using the first key to decrypt a second key in the second electronic document and governing actions with respect to the second electronic document based on document-permissions information associated with the second electronic document (col.33, lines 1-67, user access according to updated rules while offline).

Regarding claims 19 and 41, Garcia teaches

encrypting an electronic document (fig.2B); and

incorporating into the encrypted electronic document an address of a document control server, document-permissions information, and an encryption key useable in decrypting the encrypted electronic document, the encryption key being encrypted with

a key generated by, and associated with a group of users of, the document control server; wherein the encryption key comprises a session key generated by the document control server, encrypting the electronic document comprises encrypting the electronic document using a document key, and incorporating comprises incorporating into the encrypted electronic document a document security payload comprising the document key and the document-permissions information, the document security payload being encrypted using the session key (fig.2C.3, col.15, lines 30-67, col.28, lines 35-60, authenticate user on access of local document over at server).

Regarding claims 45 and 56, Garcia teaches

a document control server that
receives a client request to take an action with respect to a first electronic document (col.32, lines 20-67, offline access enablement for particular files), the client request unrelated to a second electronic document (col.4, lines 25-50, create documents off-line); and

synchronizes offline access information with a client in response to a client request, to pre-authorize offline access to an electronic document by sending an update to the offline access information retained at the client, the update comprising a first key associated with a group, the first key being useable at the client to access the electronic document by decrypting a second key in the electronic document (col.33, lines 1-55, update stored rules); and

the client that stores the first key in a memory and allows access to the electronic document, when offline, by a user as a member of the group, using the first key to

decrypt the second key in the electronic document and governing actions with respect to the electronic document based on document-permissions information associated with the electronic document (col.33, lines 1-67, user access according to updated rules while offline).

Regarding claims 4 and 26, Garcia teaches wherein the client allows actions with respect to the second electronic document based on document-permissions information residing in the second electronic document (col.13, lines 1-55).

Regarding claims 5 and 27, Garcia teaches wherein the offline access information update further comprises document-permissions information associated with multiple documents, including the second electronic document, and the client allows actions with respect to the second electronic document based on the document-permissions information (col.33, lines 1-67).

Regarding claims 6 and 28, Garcia teaches wherein synchronizing offline access information with the client comprises synchronizing silently in a background process without the user being aware of the update (col.33, lines 1-67).

Regarding claims 7 and 29, Garcia teaches wherein the request requires authentication, the method further comprising verifying the user at the client as an authenticated user (col.32, lines 20-67).

Regarding claims 8 and 30, Garcia teaches wherein the offline access information update further comprises: at least one user-specific key; at least one group-specific key, including the first key; and at least one set of document-permissions information associated with multiple documents (col.33, lines 1-67).

Regarding claims 9 and 31, Garcia teaches receiving an offline audit log from the client (col.31, lines 30-45).

Regarding claims 10 and 32, Garcia teaches wherein the at least one set of document-permissions information comprises one or more policies associated with the first document, and the offline access information update further comprises a document revocation list (col.33, lines 1-67).

Regarding claims 11 and 33, Garcia teaches wherein the offline access information update further comprises at least one set of document-permissions information, associated with a specific document, selected based on synchronization prioritization information (col.33, lines 1-67).

Regarding claims 13 and 35, Garcia teaches wherein governing actions with respect to the electronic document comprises obtaining the document-permissions information from the electronic document (col.13, lines 1-67).

Regarding claims 14 and 36, Garcia teaches wherein governing actions with respect to the electronic document comprises: identifying a document policy reference in the electronic document; and obtaining locally retained document-permissions information based on the document policy reference (col.13, lines 1-67).

Regarding claims 15 and 37, Garcia teaches wherein the offline access information update comprises at least one user-specific key, at least one group-specific key, including the first key, at least one set of document-permissions information associated with multiple documents, and a document revocation list (col.13, lines 1-67).

Regarding claims 16 and 38, Garcia teaches preventing access to the document, when offline, if a difference between a current time and a receipt time of the offline access information exceeds a server-synchronization-frequency parameter (col.33, lines 1-67).

Regarding claims 17 and 39, Garcia teaches wherein the server-synchronization- frequency parameter is specific to the document (col.33, lines 1-67).

Regarding claims 18 and 40, Garcia teaches maintaining an offline audit log; and uploading the offline audit log when online (col.31, lines 30-45).

Regarding claims 21 and 43, Garcia teaches wherein the document security payload further comprises a document identifier assigned by the document control server, and incorporating further comprises incorporating into the encrypted electronic document a copy of the session key encrypted using a public key associated with the document control server (col.15, lines 1-67).

Regarding claims 22 and 44, Garcia teaches wherein the document-permissions information specifies access permissions at a level of granularity smaller than the electronic document (col.13, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 46, Garcia teaches wherein the electronic document comprises the document-permissions information (col.33, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 47, Garcia teaches wherein the second key comprises a session key generated by the document control server, and the electronic document further comprises a document security payload comprising a document key and the

document-permissions information, the document security payload being encrypted using the session key (col.33, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 48, Garcia teaches wherein the offline access information update further comprises: at least one user-specific key; at least one group-specific key, including the first key; and at least one set of document-permissions information associated with multiple documents (col.33, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 49, Garcia teaches wherein the client comprises an agent that periodically contacts the document control server to synchronize the offline access information (col.33, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 50, Garcia teaches wherein the document control server comprises: a server core with configuration and logging components; an internal services component that provides functionality across dynamically loaded methods; and dynamically loaded external service providers, including one or more access control service providers (col.32, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 51, Garcia teaches a business logic tier comprising a cluster of document control servers, including the document control server; an application tier including the client comprising a viewer client, a securing client, and an administration client; and a load balancer that routes client requests to the document control servers (col.32, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 52, Garcia teaches wherein the client request comprises a request from the client to take an action with respect to a second document, and the

document control server synchronizes offline access information with the client silently in a background process without the user being aware of the update (col.33, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 53, Garcia teaches wherein the document control server comprises a permissions-broker server including a translation component, the second document comprises a document secured previously by the permissions-broker server, and the translation component being operable to translate first document-permissions information in a first permissions-definition format into second document-permissions information in a second permissions-definition format in response to the request being received from the client (col.32, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 54, Garcia teaches wherein the server comprises a permissions- broker server operable to identify information associated with the second document in response to the request, the associated information being retained at the server and indicating a third electronic document different from and associated with the second document, the server being operable to relate information concerning the third electronic document to the client to facilitate the action to be taken (col.33, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 55, Garcia teaches wherein the server comprises a permissions- broker server operable to obtain and send, in response to the request, a software program comprising instructions operable to cause one or more data processing apparatus to perform operations effecting an authentication procedure, and the client uses the authentication program to identify a current user and control the action with respect to the second document based on the current user and document-permissions information associated with the second document (col.32, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 57, Garcia teaches server means for dynamically obtaining and sending authentication processes in response to client requests to take actions with respect to electronic documents; and client means for interfacing with a received authentication process to identify a current user and for controlling actions with respect to electronic documents based on the current user and document-permissions information (col.31, lines 1-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

14. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

15. Claims 2-3 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garcia.

Regarding claim 2 and 24, Garcia does not expressly disclose wherein synchronizing offline access information with the client comprises comparing a time of last recorded client- synchronization with a time of last change in user-group information for the user. However, Examiner takes Official Notice that the USE of comparing times to determine whether to update or not was conventional and well known. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to compare times of last changed when synchronizing content since Examiner takes Official Notice that it was conventional and well known.

Regarding claims 3 and 25, Garcia does not expressly disclose wherein synchronizing offline access information with the client comprises: receiving user-group information for the user from the client; and comparing current user-group information

Art Unit: 2436

for the user with the received user-group information for the user from the client.

However, Examiner takes Official Notice that the USE of comparing membership was conventional and well known. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to compare times of last changed when synchronizing content since Examiner takes Official Notice that it was conventional and well known.

Conclusion

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

17. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to 99 whose telephone number is (571)272-5861. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday and Thursday-Friday.

19. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on (571)272-4195. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

20. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/David García Cervetti/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2436